

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION
OFFICE OF AUDITS AND COMPLIANCE

COMPLIANCE PEER REVIEW

REPORT OF FINDINGS

PAROLE
OPERATIONS

DIVISION OF JUVENILE PAROLE OPERATIONS, STOCKTON

APRIL 8 THROUGH 10, 2008

The seal of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation is a circular emblem. It features a central shield with a balance scale, symbolizing justice. The words "DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION" are inscribed around the top inner edge of the circle, and "STATE OF CALIFORNIA" is inscribed around the bottom inner edge.

PRELIMINARY

CONDUCTED BY

COMPLIANCE/PEER REVIEW BRANCH

CONTACT STANDARDS

Division of Juvenile Justice Parole Services Manual, Sections 4170, 4160,
1350, 1210; and Subsections 18, 20, 23, 56 and 57

Office of Audits and Compliance Staff
George Valencia, Youth Authority Administrator
Mark Fridlund, Parole Agent III

PRELIMINARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
BACKGROUND.....	3
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	6
GLOSSARY.....	11

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of Audits and Compliance, Compliance/Peer Review Branch (CPRB) reviewed the Division of Juvenile Justice Parole Services Manual, Sections 4170, 4160, 1350, 1210, and Subsections 18, 20, 23, 56, and 57 to determine whether the Division of Juvenile Parole Operations, Stockton (DJPOS) is in compliance with the contact standards for the supervision of parolees.

The review period was January 1, 2004 through January 31, 2008. The date range was selected to accommodate the sample of parolees initially released from the institutions during various periods. As of March 13, 2008, the DJPOS maintains responsibility for the supervision of 207 parolees. From this population, an approximate sample size of 20 cases (10 percent) were selected to be reviewed. The selected cases consist of parolees that were assigned to Intensive Re-Entry (IRE), Regular Re-Entry (RRE), maximum, medium and minimum supervision levels. Of the 20 parolees sampled, three were assigned a minimum supervision level, five were assigned a medium supervision level, five were assigned to a maximum supervision level, two met the IRE supervision criteria and five met the RRE supervision criteria.

The Supervising Parole Agent (SPA), Assistant Supervising Parole Agent (ASPA) and two field parole agents were interviewed to gain an understanding of the contact and supervision standards and to cross reference the data obtained to determine whether contact and supervision standards were being met.

The findings are as follows:

Parole agents responsible for managing the IRE supervision of parolees are not complying with the following guidelines:

- Assigning the supervision levels at subsequent case review summaries.
- Meeting contact guidelines from the parolee's assigned supervision level.
- Meeting contact standards for the first 30 days at initial release from the institution.

Parole agents responsible for managing the RRE supervision of parolees are not complying with the following guidelines:

- Meeting face-to-face contact guidelines for contacting the parolee within two working days, after initial release from the institution.
- Meeting contact guidelines from the parolee's assigned supervision level.
- Meeting contact standards for the first 30 days at initial release from the institution.

Parole agents responsible for managing maximum supervision parolees are not complying with the following guidelines:

- Assigning a supervision level when the parolee is released from the institution.
- Assigning the supervision levels at subsequent case review summaries.
- Contacting the parolee within two working days, after initial release from the institution.
- Meeting contact guidelines from the parolee's assigned supervision level.
- Meeting contact guidelines while a parolee was in custody.
- Meeting contact standards for the first 30 days at initial release from the institution.
- Meeting half the number of contact standards with the parolee in the field, for the first 30 days.

Parole agents responsible for managing medium supervision parolees are not complying with the following guidelines:

- Assigning a supervision level when the parolee is released from the institution.
- Assigning the supervision levels at subsequent case review summaries.
- Contacting the parolee within two working days, after initial release from the institution.
- Meeting the contact guidelines from the parolee's assigned supervision level.
- Meeting contact guidelines while a parolee was in custody.
- Meeting weekly contacts with the parolee for the first 30 days at initial release from the institution.
- Meeting half the number of contact standards with the parolee in the field, for the first 30 days.

Parole agents responsible for managing minimum supervision parolees are not complying with the following guidelines:

- Assigning a supervision level when the parolee is released from the institution.
- Meeting the contact guidelines from the parolee's assigned supervision level.
- Meeting half the number of contact standards with the parolee in the field, for the first 30 days.

BACKGROUND

The CPRB met with the acting director for the Division of Juvenile Parole Operations (DJPO) on January 14, 2008. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the peer review process and to identify areas of high risk to be included in the review. The DJPO indicated an area of concern was parole agents adhering to the contact supervision standards with parolees.

The DJPO's concern was whether parolees were receiving the proper supervision in accordance with the policy from the Parole Services Manual. Further, the DJPO indicated if supervision was lacking, it is essential that the problems are identified to take the necessary steps in correcting the deficiency. The purpose for proper supervision of parolees in the field is early intervention, and to monitor the parolees progress. If necessary, adjustments can be made to the parolee's supervision level to protect the public from criminal behaviors, and assist the parolee by providing the necessary services for a successful reintegration into society.

The table below shows the total parole agents assigned to DJPOS, vacancies, number of positions filled, and agents out on medical leave as of April 8, 2008.

Classification	Assigned	Vacant	Filled	Out on Medical
Parole Agent I	2	1	1 (full-time) and 1 Retired Annuitant	
Parole Agent II Specialist	3	0	3	2 Agents are FMLA Qualified
Parole Agent II Supervisor	1	0	1	
Parole Agent III	1	0	1	
Total	7	1	6	0

Note: Two parole agents are Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) qualified. These agents were working at the time of the review, but as FMLA issues arrive, they are afforded the opportunity to take time off.

The DJPOS has parolees that are on parole for various offenses, such as: Assault with a Deadly Weapon, Vehicle Theft, Second Degree Robbery, Sexual Offenses, Health and Safety Violations, Carjacking, Assault with a Firearm, etc.

The specific objectives were taken from the Division of Juvenile Justice Parole Services Manual. The CPRB developed its scope, objective, and methodology in accordance with the Parole Services Manual, Contact Standards and Supervision of Parolees. The CPRB is aware that there is a newly revised Parole Services Manual that addresses the contact and supervision standards of parolees. However, that manual has not yet been finalized.

The specific objectives of the review were to determine whether:

- The first face-to-face contact with each parolee occurred within two working days after release to parole. Parole Services Manual, Section 1210, Performance Standard 18.
- Parole agents are adhering to the parole contact guidelines from the Parole Services Manual, Section 1350 and 1210, Performance Standard 23:
 1. Upon initial release, the parole agent is required to make one face-to-face contact a week with parolees unless the parolee is on the IRE status.
 2. Parole agents are required to make face-to-face contact twice per month with parolees assigned a maximum supervision level.
 3. Parole agents are adhering to the established standards for a parolee's supervision level which is determined at the time of release to parole and subsequently at each case conference.
 4. Parole agents are required to make one face-to-face contact per month with parolees assigned a medium supervision level.
 5. Parole agents are required to make one face-to-face contact every other month with parolees assigned a minimum supervision level.
 6. For all missing cases, (parolees that have absconded from parole supervision), parole agents are required to make collateral contacts according to the assigned supervision level.
 7. During the first 30 days of supervision, parole agents assigned to IRE cases are required to make contact with the parolee no less than eight times and not less than once per week. For the remaining 60 day period, the parole agent is required to make contact with the parolee no less than four times per month and not less than once every two weeks.

Note: No written policy was found in the Parole Services Manual that specifically addresses the RRE policy. After conducting interviews with parole agents and reviewing the Parole Services Manual, Section 4170, it was determined that the procedure for RRE cases was to make contact with the parolee once a week for the first 30 days.

- Parole agents are contacting each assigned parolee in custody as needed, no less than once every 30 days. Parole Services Manual, Section 1210, Performance Standards 57.
- Parole agents are contacting each parolee at least weekly during the first 30 days following release. At least half of the minimum number of contacts will be in the field away from the parole agents home or office and preferably at the parolee's place of residence, place of employment, school, etc. Any exception must be approved in advance by the SPA. Parole Services Manual, Section 1210, Performance Standard 18.

For the purpose of this review, the Stockton Parole Office was toured by members of the review team, randomly selected staff were informally interviewed regarding the current practices based upon their interest and willingness to talk to the reviewers.

The CPRB will determine whether the objectives are met by reviewing:

- The Parole Services Manual that addresses the Supervision of Parolees, Initial Contact, and the Parole Agents Performance Standards (Administration Chapter, Section 1210);
- Field Information System or the Parole Agent's Field Book;
- Information obtained from interviews with the Director of DJPO, parole agents, clerical staff, ASPA, and SPA;
- Supporting documentation in the parolee's field file (Case Review Summary, Annual Good Cause, and Violation/Disposition Reports); and
- A random sample of 20 (10 percent) parolee records were selected to determine whether the field parole agents were in compliance with the supervision and contact standards of the Parole Services Manual.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Finding I: The DJPOS is not meeting half the minimum number of contacts in the field for parolees initially released from the institution for the first 30 days, that are assigned to a maximum, medium, or minimum supervision level.

In the maximum supervision category, five cases were reviewed. Of the five maximum cases reviewed two (40 percent) were not seen according to the standard.

For the medium supervision category, five cases were reviewed. Of the five medium cases reviewed, two (40 percent) were not seen according to the standard.

In the minimum supervision category, three cases were reviewed. Of the three cases reviewed, two (67 percent) were not seen according to the standard.

Note: Parolees were selected from the categories of maximum, medium and minimum supervision to identify how these categories were complying with the Parole Service Manual, Section 1210, Performance Standard 18, when they were released for the first 30 days.

Criteria:

Parole Services Manual, Section 1210, Performance Standard 18, states: The parole agent will contact each parolee at least weekly during the first 30 days following release. "At least half of the minimum number of contacts will be in the field away from the parole agent's home or office and preferably at the parolee's place of residence, place of employment, school or community agency organization. Any exception must be approved in advance by the SPA."

Finding II: The DJPOS is not meeting the weekly contact standards for the first 30 days with parolees that are initially released from the institution and assigned to IRE, RRE, maximum, medium, and minimum supervision.

In the IRE supervision category, two cases were reviewed. Of the two cases reviewed, one (50 percent) was not seen weekly.

For the RRE supervision category, a total of five cases were reviewed. Of the five cases reviewed, four (80 percent) were not seen weekly.

In the maximum supervision category, five cases were reviewed. Of the five cases reviewed, three (60 percent) were not seen weekly.

For the medium supervision category, five cases were reviewed. Of the five cases reviewed, two (40 percent) were not seen weekly.

In the minimum supervision category, three cases were reviewed. Of the three cases reviewed, two (66 percent) were not seen weekly.

Note: Parolees were selected from the categories of IRE, RRE, maximum, medium and minimum supervision to identify how these categories were complying with Parole Service Manual, Section 1350 and 1210, Performance Standard 23, when they were released for the first 30 days.

Criteria:

Parole Services Manual, Section 1210, Performance Standard 23 states: "For Initial Release, the parole agent will make one face-to-face contact per week with the parolees that are initially released unless the parolee is on the IRE status."

And

Parole Service Manual, Section 1350, states: During the first 30 days of supervision, parole agents assigned to IRE cases are required to make contact with the parolee no less than eight times and not less than once per week. For the remaining 60 day period, the parole agent is required to make contact with the parolee no less than four times per month and not less than once every two weeks.

Finding III: The DJPOS is not contacting the parolee at least once every 30 days while the parolee is in custody that are assigned to a maximum and medium supervision category.

For the maximum supervision category, five cases were reviewed. Two of the five were not applicable. Of the remaining three cases, one (33 percent) was not seen once every 30 days, while in custody.

In the medium supervision category, five cases were reviewed. Three of the five were not applicable. Of the remaining two cases, one (50 percent) was not contacted at least once every 30 days, while in custody.

Note: Cases that were not applicable were cases that were not in custody.

Criteria:

Parole Services Manual, Section 1210, Performance Standard 57, states: "Parole agents are to contact each assigned parolee in custody as needed, no less than once every 30 days."

Finding IV: The DJPOS is not meeting the contact standards for parolees assigned to a supervision level of IRE, RRE, maximum, medium, or minimum.

For the IRE supervision category, two cases were reviewed. Of the two cases reviewed, all were not seen according to their assigned supervision level.

In the RRE supervision category, five cases were reviewed. Of the five cases reviewed, four (80 percent) were not seen according to their assigned supervision level.

For the maximum supervision category, five cases were reviewed. Of the five cases reviewed, three (60 percent) were not seen according to the assigned maximum supervision level.

For the medium supervision category, five cases were reviewed. Of the five cases reviewed, two (40 percent) were not seen according to the assigned medium supervision level.

In the minimum supervision category, three cases were reviewed. Of the three cases reviewed, one (33 percent) was not seen according to the assigned minimum supervision level.

Note: The most recent CRS's were utilized to review the IRE, RRE, maximum, medium and minimum cases.

Criteria:

Parole Services Manual, Section 1210, Performance Standard 23, states: "Parole agents will adhere to the established standards for the parolee's supervision level determined at the time of release to parole and subsequently at each case conference."

Finding V: The DJPOS is not making face-to-face contacts within two working days for parolees that are initially released from the institution and assigned to a RRE, maximum, or medium supervision level.

In the RRE supervision category, five cases were reviewed. Of the five cases reviewed, four (80 percent) did not receive face-to-face contact within two working days after initial release to parole.

For the maximum supervision category, five cases were reviewed. Of the five cases reviewed, two (40 percent) did not receive face-to-face contact within two working days after initial release to parole.

For the medium supervision category, five cases were reviewed. Of the five cases reviewed, three (60 percent) did not receive face-to-face contact within two working days after initial release to parole.

Criteria:

Parole Services Manual, Section 1210, Performance Standard 18, states: "The parole agent will make the first face-to-face contact with each parolee will occur within two working days after their release to parole."

Finding VI: The DJPOS is not assigning a supervision level at subsequent case reviews for parolees with an IRE, maximum, or medium supervision level.

For the IRE supervision category, two cases were reviewed. Of the two cases reviewed, all were not assigned a supervision level after the case review summary.

For the maximum supervision category, five cases were reviewed. Of the five cases reviewed, one (20 percent) was not assigned a supervision level after the case review summary.

In the medium supervision category, five cases were reviewed. Of the five cases reviewed, one (20 percent) was not assigned a supervision level after the case review summary.

Finding VII: The DJPOS is not meeting the criteria for assigning a supervision level at initial release to parole for parolees that are on IRE, maximum, medium, and minimum supervision.

In the maximum supervision category five cases were reviewed. Of the five cases reviewed, one (20 percent) was not assigned a supervision level at release.

In the medium supervision category five cases were reviewed. Of the five cases reviewed, one (20 percent) was not assigned a supervision level at release.

In the minimum supervision category three cases were reviewed. Of the three cases reviewed one (33 percent) was not assigned a supervision level at release.

Criteria for findings VI and VII:

Parole Services Manual, Section 1210, Performance Standard 23, states: "Parole agents will adhere to established standards for parolee's supervision level determined at the release to parole and subsequently at each case conference."

Note: For all the findings, there was one exception noted by the SPA for the contact standards and supervision of the parolees.

Recommendations:

Below are the recommendations for the seven findings:

The SPA monitor the case review summaries to ensure that parole agents are adhering to the contacts standards for the supervision of parolees.

The SPA conduct training on the contact standards and supervision of parolees, with the ASPA and the parole agents.

Review the proposed revision of the Parole Services Manual to ensure that it addresses contact and supervision standards for the parolee population.

Include clear policy that addresses the RRE in the Parole Services Manual.

Review of Parolee Contact Standards

STOCKTON PAROLE

GLOSSARY

ASPA	Assistant Supervising Parole Agent
CPRB	Compliance Peer Review Branch
DJPO	Division of Juvenile Parole Operations
DJPOS	Division of Juvenile Parole Operations Stockton
IRE	Intensive Re-Entry
RRE	Regular Re-Entry
SPA	Supervising Parole Agent

**Information Security Compliance Review
Division of Juvenile Parole Operations, Stockton
Exit Conference Discussion Notes
April 8, 2008**

The Office of Audits and Compliance, Information Security Branch (ISB) conducted an Information Security Compliance Review of the Division of Juvenile Parole Operations, Stockton (DJPOS). The review covered 6 different areas. The DJPOS was fully compliant in 4 areas, partially compliant in 1 area, and non-compliant in 1 area. The overall score is 87.8 percent. The chart below details these outcomes. Other observations are also noted.

FINDINGS SUMMARY:

		Score	Compliant	Partial Compliance	Non Compliant
STAFF COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT					
1.	Compliance E-Mail Form is on file.	77%		PC	
2.	Annual Self-Certification of Information Security Awareness and Confidentiality forms are on file.	NA			
3.	Information security training is current.	NA			
4.	Staff log on are using own password.	100%	C		
5.	Network access authorization is on file.	92%	C		
6.	Physical locations of CPUs agree to inventory records.	67%			NC
7.	Staff CPUs labeled "No Inmate/Ward Access."	NA			
8.	Staff monitors are not visible to inmates/ward	N/A			
9.	Anti virus updates are current.	91%	C		
10.	Security patches are current.	100%	C		

PAROLEE COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT (Education, Library, Clerks)					
11.	Physical location of CPUs agrees to inventory records	N/A			
12.	CPU labeled as inmate/ward computer.	N/A			
13.	Anti virus updates are current.	N/A			
14.	Inmate monitors are visible to supervisor.	N/A			
15.	Portable media is controlled.	N/A			
16.	Telecommunications access is restricted.	N/A			
17.	Operating system access is restricted.	N/A			
18.	Printer access is restricted.	N/A			

Total of Tests	6	3	1	1
Overall Percentage	87.8%			

Please Note:

1. Tests marked with "N/A" were not tested due to the differences between adult and youth policies. There are no youth policies for these tests, and therefore the tests were not performed.

**Information Security Compliance Review
Division of Juvenile Parole Operations, Stockton
Exit Conference Discussion Notes
April 8, 2008**

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The objectives of the Information Security Compliance Review were to:

- Assess compliance to selected information security requirements,
- Evaluate other conditions discovered during the course of fieldwork that may jeopardize the security of information assets of the facility or of the Department, and
- Provide information security training for management and staff.

The ISB did not review any Prison Industry Authority computers.

In conducting the fieldwork the ISB performed the following procedures:

- Interviewed senior management, information technology staff, institutional staff, and computer users.
- Asked staff to provide evidence that all authorized computer users had Acceptable Use Agreement forms and appropriate training support documentation on file.
- Tested selected information security attributes of users and IT equipment using three different population samples. This included both the staff and inmate computing environments.
- Reviewed various laws, policies and procedures, and other criteria related to information security in the custody environment.
- Conducted physical inspection of selected computers.
- Observed the activities of the information technology support staff.
- Analyzed the information gathered through the above processes and formulated conclusions.

**Information Security Compliance Review
Division of Juvenile Parole Operations, Stockton
Exit Conference Discussion Notes
April 8, 2008**

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The ISB provided a copy of our review guide to your IT staff. It contains criteria and detailed methodology. That information, therefore, is not duplicated under each finding.

ISB's findings and recommendations are listed below. ISB staff discussed them with management in an exit conference following our fieldwork. Please contact us if you would like to discuss further any of these issues.

- 1. The Computing Technology Use Agreements (Form 1857) or the Internet and Email Policy Compliance Form are not on file for all computer users. (77 percent compliance)**

Recommendation: Require all users (both staff and contractors) to complete a Form 1857 before being granted computer access. (Department Operations Manual (DOM) 48010.8, 48010.8.2) (Institution and Camps Branch Manual (I&C Manual) 1735)

- 2. Former employees have network access authorization. (92 percent compliance)**

Recommendation: Access to any CDCR computerized information is restricted to authorized persons. The sensitive nature of CDCR data requires strict controls over who is allowed access to it. (DOM 49020.10)

Best Practice: Clean up current formal reporting procedure so all staff employment and job duty changes are reported to the IT Coordinator.

- 3. Physical locations of staff computers do not agree to inventory records. (67 percent compliance)**

Recommendation: Maintain accurate inventory records. (I&C 1720) (State Administrative Manual (SAM) Section 8652) (DOM 46030.1, 49010.4). Evaluate procedures and resources used to maintain inventory records.

**Information Security Compliance Review
Division of Juvenile Parole Operations, Stockton
Exit Conference Discussion Notes
April 8, 2008**

OTHER OBSERVATIONS:

Observation 1: Critical data in some areas is not being backed up.

Recommendation: Each department manager should identify all data that is critical to their operations is backed up regularly, including locally developed databases. The department managers should develop back-up and restoration procedures. A regular back up schedule should be established and enforced. (SAM 4842.2) (DOM 48010.9.3)